DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 219 24 HE 000 313

By- Cross, K. Patricia
Conference on Student Personnel. Final Report.
California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No- BR-5-0248
Pub Date Oct 68
Contract- OEC-6-10-106
Note- 26p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
Descriptors- *Educational Innovation, Educational Research, *Educational Strategies, *Higher Education, *Research Utilization, Student College Relationship, Student Development, Student Participation, *Student Personnel Programs

Student personnel administrators and research specialists from US and Canadian colleges and universities discussed how to use current research data in improving educational programs. Workshops focused on possible solutions to specific student personnel problems at 3 kinds of institutions: junior colleges and small state colleges, liberal arts colleges, and large state colleges and universities. Suggested changes included programs geared to student counseling and development, faculty-administration-student cooperation, and student participation in university-sponsored community activities. In one instance the establishment of a computerized student information system was proposed, and in another the formation of a "think factory" to engage in discussions on campus problems. During the conference, each participant developed an innovative program for his campus that was then evaluated by conference consultants. Subjects covered curriculum and leadership development, student counseling and college activities, and student personnel administration. After further assessment of their proposals, the 83 participants will attempt to establish the new programs at their campuses. A survey will be made in Spring 1969 to determine whether they were instituted; and if so, what the results of actual application were. (WM)

PA-24
BR-5-0248-3-3

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-0248-3-3
Contract No. OE-6-10-106

CONFERENCE ON STUDENT PERSONNEL
(June 30-July 4, 1968)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

October 1968

ED025219

HE000 313

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-0248-3-3
Contract No. OE-6-10-106

CONFERENCE ON STUDENT PERSONNEL
(June 30-July 4, 1968)

K. Patricia Cross

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

October 1968

The research reported herein was performed purusant to a contract from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE. 1

THE PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE 2

PRESENTATIONS BY CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT DIRECTORS. 3

Address by Dr. Warren Bryan Martin 3

Address by Dr. David Whittaker 5

Address by Dr. Mary Regan. 6

WORKSHOPS 8

The Merritt Community College Group. 9

The Ottawa University Group. 10

The East Tennessee State University Group. 11

INDIVIDUAL INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS. 12

CONCLUSION. 13

APPENDIX A: THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM i

APPENDIX B: CONFERENCE STAFF iii

APPENDIX C: CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS. v

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE

A major premise of the development and dissemination program of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is that research into the problems of higher education can have real value only if they are given specific application in American colleges and universities. Early in 1968, the Center was asked by the Professional Development and Standards Committee of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) if the results of Center research concerning student personnel administration could be made available to that organization. To this end, the Center proceeded to plan a Conference on Innovation for Student Development.

The direct purpose of the conference was to bring together college student personnel administrators and research specialists from the Center. The goal of the conference was to attempt to improve the impact of higher education on student development. The Research Officer of NASPA, John L. Blackburn, asked specifically that the emphasis of the conference be placed on "the importance of the student society and its subcultures to the achievement of institutional educational objectives." All planning for the conference, then, aimed toward these objectives: to make available to student personnel officers the fruits of Center research in the field, to offer them the opportunity for direct confrontation with Center research project directors, to guide them toward the solution of problems in selected areas, and to encourage them to work out innovative solutions to actual problems at their own campuses.

THE PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference was held on the campus of the University of California in Berkeley from June 30 through July 4, 1968. Eighty-two institutions of higher learning were represented among conference participants, who came from 31 states and from Canada. The general geographical distribution of participants is as follows: Midwestern states 34, western states 18, eastern states 15, southern states 13, and Canada 2. Of these participants, 52 were directly responsible for student personnel programs at their home institutions, 3 were vice presidents of colleges or universities, 41 were deans of students, and 8 were either deans of men or deans of women.

Co-chairmen of the conference were: Dr. Allan W. Rodgers, Dean of Men at Indiana State University at Terre Haute, and Mr. Thomas McLeod, Assistant Dean of Men at the University of Alabama, who represented NASPA. Arrangements for the Center were made by Dr. K. Patricia Cross, Coordinator of Development Activities.

The task of each conference participant was to develop an innovative student personnel program for his own campus. To facilitate the accomplishment of this task, the conference schedule was arranged in three parts: the first day's program consisted of presentations by three Center research project directors; the second day's program consisted of workshops with administrative teams representing three selected institutions of higher learning (a university, a liberal arts college, and a junior college); and the third day's program was devoted to individual consulting sessions and the preparation of each participant's innovative program. In attendance at all sessions, to serve

as sources of information and advice, were six senior deans representing NASPA and three research project directors representing the Center. Other NASPA and Center representatives were available at all times for consultation.

PRESENTATIONS BY CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT DIRECTORS

The first day's presentations for the Center were made by Dr. Warren Bryan Martin, Dr. David Whittaker, and Dr. Mary Regan.

Address by Dr. Warren Bryan Martin

Dr. Warren Bryan Martin directly approached the major theme of the conference with his opening address, "The Development of Innovation: Making Reality Change." Abstractions about educational change are not enough, Dr. Martin said; we must meet the need for change which exists now. This need is evident because of the passiveness of students and the inertness of subject matter and because we do not train students to relate to the noncognitive dimensions of life--in short, because education is professional but not socially functional. Innovation in education will come, he stated, because it is demanded by the future prospects of a technological society and because the young people of our society have already recognized that the old values are no longer effective.

But today's initiative for innovation, Dr. Martin pointed out, comes from sources outside the educational institutions, from industry (which requires technological training) and from government (which is concerned with what changes will be made). More, educational faculties are reluctant to make innovations because of tradition and because they do not know how to make changes. Students are often acquiescent and

powerless, while administrators are restricted by financial considerations.

Dr. Martin made several concrete suggestions about what can be done. He suggested that a systems approach might be adopted, that administrative personnel might be rotated to obtain for them a broader familiarity with total problems, that a variety of all-campus seminars might be instituted, that any new arrangement whereby students could assume more responsibility (community involvement or a voice in forming academic policy) might be established. "Told to exercise independence," Dr. Martin said, "the student has learned to conform or be called subversive." But it is precisely the opposite of conformity which is needed, he asserted, if fruitful innovation is to occur.

The student personnel administrators were challenged by Dr. Martin to take the initiative in innovation. Specifically, he said, they could seek an information exchange and stimulate criticism of information offered; they could set up workshops to discuss educational change; they could establish faculty study centers to disseminate information about research findings; they could put research and development concepts into practice in their own offices; they could seize any accessible means for innovation, no matter how small, such as fostering discussion classes or independent study. Since it is the students who are really interested in change and who are to be most affected by it, Dr. Martin urged the student personnel administrators to become the leaders for change. And since the change will come, he told them, they occupy key positions for determining just what changes will be made.

Address by Dr. David Whittaker

Dr. David Whittaker, in his presentation, "Student Subcultures Reviewed and Revisited," examined the social and psychological aspects of innovation for student development. Looking back on what has been written on the subject in the past 40 years or more, Dr. Whittaker stated that many of the problems have a familiar ring, that one of the continuing tasks is to put the fruits of educational research into actual practice. Emphasis on research into student development has increased in recent years, and there is no longer any doubt that what students learn is determined to a very large extent by factors outside curricular work. It is necessary, consequently, to study what these outside factors are.

Since the large numbers of students in institutions of higher learning in this country make the study of them a formidable undertaking, Dr. Whittaker suggested that the problem could be made more manageable if we studied subcultures, which he described as "broad patterns of differing orientations" which could be subcategorized and studied in detail. Such an approach, although sometimes limiting, could give an increased appreciation of the complexities of the problem and could stimulate integrative research.

The researcher assumes, Dr. Whittaker said, that all human behavior is an ongoing series of efforts to cope with problems. A subculture, then, can be defined in terms of the similarity of such confrontation, shared values, and the copying of behavior. The factors that produce subcultures come from two sources: the group's frame of reference and the situation which the members of the group confront.

But the researcher finds open to him a variety of approaches to his study of students. Cross-cultural studies attempt to compare students in different countries (and cultures) by a method that is somewhat anthropological; subcultures are seen in contrast. Studies of institutions and environments are essentially studies of student characteristics wherein students are used as subjects; the students themselves are asked to evaluate their college environments. Studies of student quality and institutional influence evaluate students in terms of the way in which the existing cultural pattern of an institution determines the particular role-patterns of students. Personality studies take a more direct approach to understanding the sociopsychological aspects of students and their subcultures by obtaining individual case histories and combining data for subcultural generalizations. Identity studies have as their starting point the assumption that students of college age are striving to find roles of behavior which will suit adult lives; such studies are thus concerned with individual student development.

Using examples from a wide variety of studies (many of them current or former Center research projects), Dr. Whittaker suggested to the student personnel administrators that familiarity with the results of research into student subcultures would increase the extent of their understanding of the learning processes of students. Increased knowledge of these processes, he said, would help them to prepare for the changes which are coming in higher education.

Address by Dr. Mary Regan

Dr. Mary Regan's presentation further explored the question of innovation and its relationship to students. Her address, "Student

Change: The New Student and Society," began with the optimistic observation that student unrest and reaction to it have accelerated examination of the processes and products of education and have had the consequence of expanding the spectrum of possibilities for educational innovation. A readiness for change exists, she said, and she pointed to the "inextricable interaction and intergrowth of student and environment" as the essence of educational purpose.

Innovations provide possibilities for students, Dr. Regan said, but the possibilities must come from education itself. The non-intellectual student must be given the opportunity to become intellectual, and the already-intellectual student must be given the opportunity to develop his creative abilities. It is the responsibility of all educational participants--faculty, administrators, and students themselves--to understand the diversity of student needs and to plan innovation carefully.

Placing the student in the environment in which he lives--the post-World War-II environment of mass media, free-speech and civil-rights movements, Hippie and McLuhan messages--Dr. Regan stated that an increasing number of students are looking for a bridge across the gulf which now separates actual experience from academic promise. They are looking, basically, for values relevant to the soceity in which they live; they are seeking to study themselves instead of traditional educational subjects. Innovation must face in this direction, Dr. Regan said. It must recognize the "new student," who is rapidly becoming more than a campus minority. And it is the student personnel administrator who is best situated to hear this student's voice, to interpret what it is saying, and to translate its demands into constructive innovation.

Who are these new students? Basing her observations on her Center research, Dr. Regan described them as Activists (who want to affect and change society) and Self-Expressives (who are concerned with humanism and self-fulfillment). Tracing these two types of students through their academic careers (as she has done in her Center research), she defined their interests and goals and evaluated the effects of higher education on them. Her conclusion was that these students were changed in personality, in vocational aspiration, in religious orientation, and in political direction. But most important, they had become intellectually more liberal, less judgmental. They had experienced intellectual transformation.

The question that remains, however, is whether these students changed because of their institutional education or in spite of it. And beyond that question lies another: What can the experience of these students teach us about educating the others, those who were not transformed, did not learn to discover themselves and their society? Assuming that change in educational methods and goals will come--and Dr. Regan is convinced that it will--she warned the student personnel administrators that they should be prepared to take risks and sometimes even to fail. They will need courage and a well-developed philosophy, strength and insight, she told them. The role of the student personnel administrator should not be to "put out fires" but to "spark change."

WORKSHOPS

The second day's activities consisted of workshops with administrative teams. Representatives from three types of institutions of higher education met with conference participants, presented them with specific student personnel problems, and discussed possible solutions.

The institutions represented--in each case, by the president of the institution, the vice president for academic affairs, and the director of the budget--were: Merritt Community College, Oakland, California; Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas; and East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.

Assigned to each workshop was a Center research project director who acted as advisor and consultant. Dr. Dale Tillery was assigned to the group representing junior colleges and small state colleges (the Merritt Community College group); Dr. Harold Hodgkinson was assigned to the group representing liberal arts colleges (the Ottawa University group); and Dr. Mary Regan was assigned to the group representing large state colleges and universities (the East Tennessee State University group).

The Merritt Community College Group

The objective of the workshop representing junior colleges and small state colleges was to design a long-range, ongoing program which would (1) free faculty, counselors, and administrators for more frequent, direct, and meaningful contact with students; (2) provide complete and readily available information on all students to be used for advising and counseling; and (3) gain a greater commitment and involvement by all segments of the campus community in applying talent and resources to the solution of the problems facing Merritt Community College and the campus community as a whole.

The workshop members made a proposal in four parts: (1) An Innovative Team should be appointed by the president of Merritt Community College to consist of nine members representing the faculty senate, the student government, and the office of the dean of instruction. The team

would be responsible for designing and coordinating a program in which a computer would be used for establishing a student information system and for streamlining all academic recordkeeping. (2) The team would be responsible, as well, for investigating means for funding this project, exploring the possibility of obtaining financial support from government and from private foundations. (3) A Task Force should be formed, made up of both faculty and students, and should be assigned to study specific projects such as supervising systems designs, work flow, equipment evaluation, and programing. The task force would also be responsible for familiarizing the campus community with the system developed. (4) The new system should first be tested by way of a pilot program, and it should be reevaluated before being put into complete operation.

The workshop believed that this proposal had the advantage of involving all segments of the campus community--including the students--and that it attempted to state a specific recommendation--the purchase and operation of a computer.

The Ottawa University Group

The workshop representing liberal arts colleges had as its objective an innovative program which would serve to develop the student as a complete person--assumed to be the final objective of liberal arts colleges. It was understood that Ottawa University had been a stable community for a long period of time, that it was now becoming a diversified community, and that this diversity might provide interaction which would contribute to individual student development.

The proposal made by workshop members included the establishment of a "think factory." Representatives of the various segments of the

campus community would select "think factory" participants to take part in discussions and forums, these participants to come from faculty, student social clubs, and the administration of the university. The "think factory" would deal with various campus problems, would invite subjects for investigation, and would encourage interchange between diverse groups.

The East Tennessee State University Group

The workshop representing large state colleges and universities set out to establish a learning and service opportunity for students. This opportunity was to involve the student with his whole community, with the city beyond the campus as well as with the campus itself.

The proposal made by the workshop members provided that a program be worked out by a committee composed of faculty and students, with indirect responsibility assigned to university department chairmen. Administration of the committee would be handled by a coordinator, preferably a dean or an administrative director. An advisory committee, composed of faculty members, would oversee specific projects assigned to students.

In detail, it was hoped that various university departments would be able to work out a schedule of classes that would take place in the community rather than on campus, for at least some part of each week. These classes might involve the arts, social work, or study of industry and government, and would be arranged in cooperation with representatives of the off-campus community. The object would be direct observation and experience to supplement the theory of classroom study. Funding needs would be minimal, and could come from regular college sources or from educational foundations and private contributions.

Such a program would have to begin with student-faculty committee meetings and with consultation with department heads. It was suggested that a pilot program be scheduled for the spring session of 1969. A second student-faculty committee would also be formed to evaluate the pilot programs, and if the pilot program was found successful, total implementation should be realized by the fall of that year.

INDIVIDUAL INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS

The third day of the conference was devoted to the preparation of innovative programs by each conference participant. Each participant was asked to prepare an innovative program for his own campus and to suggest solutions for any problems attendant on the program. He was asked to be as specific and practical as possible while at the same time incorporating ideas not previously attempted at his home institution. Since it was hoped that many of the student personnel administrators would utilize research material from the Center, a number of Center research project directors were present for individual and group consultation. Also available were senior deans of various institutions (who were members of NASPA), to give special advice about student personnel problems, and several college administrative officials, who could discuss problems related to coordination within campuses.

Each participant left the conference with a written plan for his own area of responsibility. And all eighty-three plans were subsequently distributed to all conference participants.

The individual innovations dealt with the following general subjects: (1) the development and expansion of curriculum, (2) the development and expansion of total academic environment, (3) leadership

development, (4) student activities, (5) student personnel operation, (6) counseling service, (7) the student's role in college life, and (8) the personal problems of students.

Panels of workshop leaders and advisors evaluated the individual innovative proposals on the fourth day.

CONCLUSION

The conference was planned in an attempt to make a direct attack on the problem of using research information for the improvement of educational programs. While it would probably be unrealistic to assume that all eighty-three conference participants will be able to institute at their home campuses the innovative plans which they drew up at the workshops, it is apparent that the conference did achieve its stated goals. The student personnel administrators who attended were able--some of them for the first time perhaps--to discover and obtain the results of current research in higher education. Surely all participants in the conference were made more fully aware of the possibilities for innovation at their home campuses.

The results of the conference will continue. It is hoped that information about actual accomplishment will be forthcoming. A questionnaire has been mailed to all conference participants asking for detailed individual evaluation of each conference activity and presentation. As already mentioned, copies of all individual innovative proposals have been sent to all participants so that further individual evaluation can continue. In addition, a survey will be made in the spring of 1969 to ascertain whether the innovations have been put to practical application and, if so, what the results have been.

Members of NASPA have been most responsive and enthusiastic about the conference, and a request has been made that a second conference be held with the Center. Center research project directors who took part in the conference have also expressed broad satisfaction with conference achievements.

The Center, in participating in such conferences as this, can fulfill one of the major purposes for which it has been established--the application of research findings to actual problems of higher education.

APPENDIX A

THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Sunday, June 30

12:00 - 5:30	Registration for the Conference
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner
7:30 - 10:00	Opening Session: Address by Dr. Leland L. Medsker, Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

Monday, July 1

7:30 - 8:30	Breakfast
8:30 - 10:00	Center Presentation: Address by Dr. Warren Bryan Martin, Center Research Project Director
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Period
10:30 - 12:00	Center Presentation: Address by Dr. David Whittaker, Center Research Project Director
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:00	Center Presentation: Address by Dr. Mary Regan, Center Research Project Director
3:00 - 6:00	Individual Consultations with Center Research Project Directors
6:00 - 7:30	Dinner
7:30 - 9:30	General Session: Orientation by the Administrative Teams from Merritt Community College, Ottawa University, and East Tennessee University

Tuesday, July 2

7:30 - 8:30	Breakfast
9:00 - 12:00	Meetings of Innovative Groups with Administrative Teams and Center Research Project Directors
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 4:30	Continuation of Meetings of Innovative Groups with Administrative Teams and Center Research Project Directors in Attendance
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner
7:00 - 9:00	Presentation of Innovations to Administrative Teams for Projects at Merritt Community College, Ottawa University, and East Tennessee University
9:00 - 10:00	Evaluation of Innovations by NASPA Resource Deans

Wednesday, July 3

7:30 - 8:30	Breakfast
9:00 - 10:00	General Session: Orientation for Preparation of Individual Innovative Programs
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Period
10:30 - 12:00	Preparation of Individual Innovative Programs -- Center Research Project Directors Available for Consultation
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 4:30	Discussion of Individual Innovative Programs with other Group Members, NASPA Resource Deans, and Center Research Project Directors
5:30 - 7:00	Dinner

Thursday, July 4

7:30 - 8:30	Breakfast
8:30 - 11:30	General Session: Summary of Conference and Conclusions -- Panel Discussions by NASPA Resource Deans and Center Research Project Directors
11:30	Conference Concludes

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE STAFF

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

Dr. Leland Medsker - Director, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. K. Patricia Cross - Center Coordinator for Development and Dissemination; Director of College and University Programs, Educational Testing Service

Dr. Warren B. Martin - Associate Research Educator

Dr. Mary Regan - Assistant Research Educator, Assistant Professor of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Davis

Dr. David Whittaker - Assistant Research Educator

Dr. Dale Tillery - Associate Research Educator, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Harold Hodgkinson - Associate Research Educator, Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley

NASPA Co-Chairmen for Conference

Dr. Allan Rodgers - Associate Dean of Students, Indiana State University

Mr. Thomas A. McLeod - Assistant Dean for Student Development, University of Alabama

NASPA Chairman for Division of Professional Development and Standards

Mr. John L. Blackburn - Dean for Student Development, University of Alabama

NASPA Resource Deans

Dr. Earl Clifford - Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University

Dr. Robert Etheridge - Vice-President for Student Affairs, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

NASPA Resource Deans (Continued)

Dr. John Gillis - Executive Associate, Association of American Colleges

Dr. Richard Siggelkow - Dean of Students, State University of New York in Buffalo

Dr. Mark Smith - Dean of Men, Dennison University

College and University Administrative Teams

Merritt Community College, Oakland, California

Dean John Carr - Dean of Administration and Business

Dean Ken Castellio - Dean of Faculty and Student Personnel

Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas

Dr. Peter Armacost - President

Dr. David Bemmels - Academic Dean

Mr. Robert Bundy - Business Manager

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee

Dr. D. P. Culp - President

Dr. Mark P. Davis - Dean of Faculty

Mr. Solon Gentry - Business Manager

Local Arrangements

Dean Arleigh Williams - Dean of Students, University of California, Berkeley

Mr. Wilson Schooley - Center Manager of Dissemination and Publication

APPENDIX C

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

August E. Aamodt, Dean of Men
Centenary College of Louisiana
Rm. 24 Administration Bldg.
Shreveport, LA

Charles F. Abbott, Asst. Dean of Men
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Forrest Aldrich, Asst. Dean of Men
Pomona College
Box 24 - Walker Hall
Pomona, California 91711

Bill Baker, Dean of Students
Arkansas Tech
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

William M. Balfour
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Lawton Blanton, Dean of Students
Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Yves Bled, Dean of Men
University of Ottawa
75 Laurier Avenue East
Ottawa 2, Canada

Sister M. John Bosco Boyle
Dean of Students
Marymount College
Boca Raton, FL 33432

C. William Brown, Assoc. Dean of Men
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

Lawrence T. Butler
Asst. to the Dean of Student Affairs
University of Ill. at Chicago Circle
P.O. Box 4348
Chicago, Ill. 60680

Dr. Jack Carmichael
Dean of Student Affairs
Oral Roberts University
7777 South Lewis
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105

Donald K. Cheek
Vice President for Student Affairs
Lincoln University
Lincoln University, PA 19352

Sandra J. Clark
Sr. Residence Advisor
University of Calif. at Los Angeles
310 DeNeve Circle - Rieber Hall
Los Angeles 24, CA

Dr. Leon Cohen, Dean of Students
Borough of Manhattan Comm. College
City University of New York
134 W. 51st St.
New York, New York 10020

Lynne C. Comas
Student Activities Coordinator
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

Catherine Corbett
Director of Student Affairs and Dean of Women
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

Appendix C (Continued)

Dr. Robert E. Corley
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Ill. At Chicago Circle
P.O. Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680

Carroll C. Cotten, Dean of Students
Chapman College
333 N. Glassell St.
Orange, CA

Harold Eickhoff
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Missouri
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 53121

Ada M. Elam, Dean of Students
Bowie State College
Bowie, Maryland 20715

Magnus S. G. Flynn, Dean of Students
Sir George Williams University
1435 Drummond Street
Montreal 25, Quebec, Canada

William H. Fox, Jr. Dean of Men
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX 75222

J. Franklin, Assistant Director
Division of Student Affairs
The University of Wisconsin
514 Wisconsin Union
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Paul Fredstrom, Dean of Students
Kansas State College
Pittsburg, Kansas

Dr. Albert Fuller, Dean of Students
Graceland College
Lamoni, Iowa 50140

Donald W. Gardner
Dean of Student Affairs
Williams College
Williamstown, Mass. 01267

Ronald Gigliotti
Admin. Asst. To Vice President
Monroe Community College
410 Alexander Street
Rochester, NY 14607

James S. Gillespie
Director of Student Programs
Ohio University of Portsmouth
Portsmouth, Ohio

Joseph C. Gluck, Acting Director
Student Educational Services
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Dennis C. Golden, Asst. Dean of Men
College of the Holy Cross
Hogan Campus Center
Worcester, Mass.

Susan B. Hill, Dean of Students
Eastern Michigan University
103 Pierce Hall
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Jack Holland
Systems Advisor for Personnel Affairs
The University of Texas System
Box 7606 University Station
Austin, Texas 78712

E. L. Holloway, Dean of Student Affairs
Langston University
Box 666
Langston, Oklahoma

Phyllis Hoyt, Dean of Students
Western College for Women
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Robert C. Hughes
3011 Student Activities Bldg.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

M. L. Huit, Dean of Students
University of Iowa
111 University Hall
Iowa City, Iowa

Appendix C (Continued)

Harvey C. Johnson, Dean of Students
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

Odell Johnson, Jr., Dean of Men
St. Mary's College of California
4315 East Swift Ave. (home)
Fresno, California

James A. Jones
Dean of Student Personnel Services
Washtenaw Community College - Box 345
Ann Arbor, Michigan

William A. Jones, Jr., Dean of Students
Greenville Technical Education Center
P.O. Box 5616, Station B
Greenville, South Carolina 29606

Jann Kalbaugh, Activities Adviser - Student Personnel
Sonoma State College
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, Calif. 94928

Clair G. Kloster
Vice President for Student Affairs
Luther College
Decorah, Iowa 52101

Edward G. Kurdziel, Dean of Students
Marquette University
Brooks Memorial Union
620 N. 14th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robert C. Lathrop
Director Student Services
Tacoma Community College
5900 S. 12th Street
Tacoma, Washington

Peter Lindberg
Assoc. Dean of Students
University of California
San Francisco, Calif. 94122

Richard J. Mohline, Dean of Students
Moody Bible Institute
820 N. La Salle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Sister Mona Marie Buergler
Resident Counselor
Fontbonne College
6800 Wydown
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Catherine Brown Miller
Quadrangle Coordinator
State University of N.Y. at Albany
1400 Washington Ave.
Albany, New York 12203

Ernest M. Moore
Dean of Student Affairs
Clarkson College of Technology
Potsdam, New York 13676

Richard W. Moore, Assoc. Dean of Students
Assumption College
500 Salisbury Street
Worcester, Mass. 01609

Allen L. Morrison, Professor of Military Science and Tactics
Arkansas Polytechnic College
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Patrick J. Nally, Dean of Men
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio

J. Scott Newcomb
Coordinator of Housing Program
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Theron Pace, Director of Housing and Asst. Dean of Students
University of Redlands
Redlands, California 92373

Marianne R. Phelps, Dean of Women
George Washington University
Washington, D. C.

Griff D. Pitts, Exec. Asst. to Dean of Students
Northeastern Ill. State College
Bryn Mawr at St. Louis
Chicago, Illinois 60625

Max Rieves, Dean of Student Affairs
Edison Junior College
Ft. Myers, Fla. 33901

Eugene E. Robinson, Dean of Students
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Arthur L. Sanders
Director of Placement
West Georgia College
Carrollton, Georgia

Alvin R. Schmidt, Dean of Men
Tufts University
Medford, Mass. 02155

Erin L. Schmidt, Asst. Dean of Men
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas

Thomas B. Scott
Dean of Student Development
University of Tennessee
804 Volunteer Blvd. Temple Court
Knoxville, Tennessee

Robert H. Shaffer, Dean of Students
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Paul M. Sherwood, Dean of Students
Community College of Philadelphia
34 S. 11 Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

R. Philip Shober
Vice President for Student Affairs
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Lawrence Silverman, Dean of Students
Roosevelt University
430 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, Illinois

Howard H. Simmons
Director of Student Services
Northern Virginia Community College
3443 S. Carlyn Spring Rd.
Bailey's Crossroads, Va. 22041

Kent Slater
Asst. To Dean of Student Affairs
University of Ill. at Chicago Circle
P.O. Box 4348
Chicago, Ill. 60680

Bernard J. Sloan
Director Ridgecrest Area Residence Halls
University of Alabama - Box 3744
University, Alabama 35486

Helen A. Snyder, Assoc. Dean of Students
University of Nebraska
207 Administration Building
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Sister St. James Connell
Director of Residences
Fontbonne College
6800 Wydown
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Michael O. Stewart
Assoc. Dean of Students
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas 67601

Ralph R. Swinford, Director
Department of Student Activities
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Linda L. Tabor
Asst. to Vice President for Student Affairs
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

John B. Taylor, Counselor
California College of Arts and Crafts
1895 Pleasant Valley Ave. (Home)
Oakland, California 94611

Alvin E. Ulbrickson
Asst. Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Washington
333 Student Union Bldg.
Seattle, Washington

Thomas Vitelli
Dean of Student Affairs
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Conn. 06515

Dr. Barrie Wight
Asst. Dean of Students
3801 Cullen Blvd.
Houston, Texas 77004

Robert L. Wilson, Dean of Students
University of Evansville
Box 329
Evansville, Indiana

Robert O. Wise, Jr.
Director of Student Affairs
Rochester State Junior College
Rochester, Minnesota 55901

David S. Wood
Acting Assoc. Dean of Students
California Institute of Technology
116 Throop Hall
Pasadena, California

Fredric Zook, Dean of Students
Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas